

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application, none of which have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McClennon et al.* (US 6,721,355) in view of *Verbin* (US 2003/0031269). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 11) recites a step of "in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender, adjusting a supply voltage level by said sensor to said sending driver accordingly."

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner accuses Applicants' arguments in the previous Office Action were intended to attack *McClennon* and *Verbin* individually where the rejections were based on the combinations of *McClennon* and *Verbin*. Actually, Applicants' arguments did not attack *McClennon* and *Verbin* separately. For example, on page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner again states that "*McClennon* teaches that the modem includes a full on power mode ... except adjusting a supply voltage level by said sensor to said sending driver accordingly and in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender." In other words, the Examiner states that the claimed adjusting step is not disclosed by *McClennon*. Of course, the Examiner then asserts that the claimed adjusting step is disclosed by *Verbin* in paragraphs 0036-0042.

Since the Examiner has already stated that *McClennon* does not disclose the claimed adjusting step, there is no need to address *McClennon* regarding the claimed adjusting step. As for *Verbin*, *Verbin* teaches that when the input data stream is idle, idle data detector **18** causes transmitter **20** to enter an idle mode (paragraph 0038). When transmitter **20** enters the idle mode, idle data detector **18** causes the power consumption by transmitter **20** to be reduced. It is clear that *Verbin*'s above-mentioned teaching is not related to "in response to an amount of data that

needed to be sent by said sender, adjusting a supply voltage level by said sensor to said sending driver accordingly," as claimed. Thus, *McClennon* does not disclose the claimed adjusting step, as stated by the Examiner, and *Verbin* does not disclose the claimed adjusting step either, regardless of whether both references are being considered separately or in combination.

Claim 1 also recites a step of "transmitting data from said sender by said sending driver on said transmission line to said receiving driver according to said adjusted supply voltage level."

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed transmitting step is disclosed by *McClennon* in col. 4, lines 8-18. In col. 4, lines 8-18, *McClennon* teaches that a method for power management in a modem attached to a communications link includes monitoring a communications link for incoming data traffic, and if data traffic is detected on the communications link, the periodicity of the incoming data is determined. The power mode of the modem is then determined based on the determined periodicity of the incoming data traffic. Since *McClennon*'s teachings are related to incoming data traffic, it is not relevant to the claimed transmitting step that is related to data to be transmitted. Furthermore, since *Verbin*'s transmitter 20 is in idle mode, which means transmitter 20 is not even transmitting any data at all. Thus, *Verbin* does not disclose the claimed transmitting step either.

In addition, Claim 4 (and similarly Claim 14) recites "said sensor includes a data level detector."

On page 7 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed sensor having a data level detector is disclosed by *McClennon* in Figure 4 as a data traffic monitor 122. As pointed out by the Examiner, data traffic monitor 122 "monitors data arriving at modem 20 to determine a data arrival rate" (col. 7, lines 53-55). It is clear that monitoring data arriving at modem 20 is different from the claimed data level detector that detects "an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender."

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether consider separately or in combination, the § 103 is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 11 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0456**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS